

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7363

the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] paid tribute to a number of Senators who were involved rather actively in the passage of the wheat-cotton bill, which passed the House of Representatives early yesterday morning.

I think the RECORD should show that the distinguished majority leader himself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], as well as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the assistant majority leader, played a key role making possible a vote in the Senate on this important legislation in time to be effective on this year's crop.

During the Senate debate on that bill, one of the hard decisions the Senate had to make was on the question of whether to accept the amendment relating to beef imports offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

Some of us took the view at that time that, while we would like to see beef imports restricted, it would have been a mistake to add that amendment to the cotton and wheat bill, because it might have cost administration support for the bill in the House of Representatives.

In this morning's New York Times, Mr. William Blair, distinguished writer on agricultural affairs, reports that efforts by President Johnson were a decisive factor in securing passage of the wheat and cotton bill in the House of Representatives.

As Senators know, the bill passed in the House by a margin of eight votes. According to Mr. Blair, sources close to the administration's operation estimated that Mr. Johnson likely changed 15 to 20 votes, through his own great interest in the passage of that bill.

I believe it is certain that, had the Senate adopted the beef import amendment—important as the objective of that amendment is—it would have cost administration support for the wheat-cotton bill, and that in turn would have meant a defeat of the legislation in the House of Representatives. There is no doubt about it.

In other words, we would have ended without any wheat bill, and the beef import amendment would have gone down to defeat with it. As matters now stand, we have a wheat and cotton bill which will be signed into law by the President tomorrow at noon. The bill will save the wheat farmers about \$500 million. Twenty million dollars of that saving will be in South Dakota.

The beef import proposal is very much alive. It has already been the subject of extensive hearings before the Senate Finance Committee. A number of Senators have testified before that committee, including the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the junior Senator from South Dakota. I am hopeful that, with the prestige of the Finance Committee behind the bill, and with careful hearings completed, and perhaps with some modification that might make it somewhat more acceptable to the administration, the passage of that import legislation can be assured, so that we shall not only have the wheat and cotton bill signed into law tomorrow, but have a good prospect of

doing something about the import situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following these remarks, the article written by Mr. William Blair in today's New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON PHONE EFFORT CREDITED WITH HOUSE VICTORY ON FARM BILL—CAJOLERY, APPEALS, AND "TALKING TURKEY" SAID TO HAVE HELD WAVERING VOTES—GOP MOVED TO STALL MEASURE

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, April 9.—President Johnson appealed, cajoled, and in some instances "talked turkey" to House Members in the administration's drive to get the food-stamp and farm bills through the House early today.

His telephone calls and other efforts from the White House characterized as a major element in nailing down votes and holding straight some wavering Democrats during the 14-hour session.

Informed sources described the Democratic action as one of the best coordinated legislative lobbying efforts in recent years. As some saw it, the main problem at the end was to overcome the Republican parliamentary moves, which sought to stall the bill and cause defections from Democratic ranks.

HOUSE WORKS STALLED

In the wake of the administration's dual victory, the House was stalled today, apparently by Republican pique over the power play on the farm and food-stamp bills. No business could be transacted because of Republican calls for quorums, reading of the daily Journal, and other time-killing tactics.

It did not seem to be an organized blockade but rather expression of the resentment of a few Members against the Democratic leadership for holding the House in session into the night. The stalling was effective because many Democrats did not show up today.

The business to be brought before the House was its own legislative appropriations bill, the money measure that will keep the House running and pay Members and staffs. It could not be called for action, however, as the Republicans backed up the efforts of stallers on a party-line vote.

WOULD BOLSTER INCOME

The President is expected to sign the farm bill Saturday in a White House ceremony. The bill is aimed at bolstering the income of wheatgrowers by applying a voluntary production control program. It would also aid American textile mills through a new subsidy while at the same time help cottongrowers reduce surplus and sell more cotton.

The food-stamp bill goes to the Senate, where nothing has been done about it. Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, Democratic chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, introduced a food-stamp bill at the administration's request but has held no hearings.

President Johnson began before Easter his personal drive to get the two bills through the House quickly. He worked from a list of 25 or 26 House Members regarded as on the border line. About one-third of the list were Northern big city Members; the remainder a sprinkling of southerners, mid-westerners, and western and Mountain State Democrats. The list included a couple of Republicans.

His argument varied with the individuals. To some he cited the prospective \$600 million drop in wheat growers' income unless Congress acted. To some, mainly the more conservative southern Democrats and westerners, he dwelt on the reduction that would be achieved in the wheat and cotton programs by the bills.

To still others, his appeal was strictly partisan with emphasis: "I need your help in this election year."

BELIEVED HE WAS RIGHT

To one southerner, he calmly related that he felt he was right in his drive on poverty and that "something had to be done."

Further, he argued that the cotton situation was worsening and that the cotton section of the farm bill would help right the economics of the industry and aid all sectors of it, from cotton farmers to consumers.

One difficulty that he and his aids ran into was the deep-running resentment they found in some northern Members against southerners who voted to kill the recent pay bill that would have raised salaries throughout the Federal Establishment, including Members' pay.

Sources close to the administration's operation estimated that Mr. Johnson likely changed 15 to 20 votes. The farm bill passed by a vote of 211 to 203, which appeared to be a narrow margin. The Democrats, however, had six votes in reserve. The 2 food-stamp plan passed on a rollcall of 229 to 189.

One of the major but least publicly known figures in the fight was Kenneth M. Birkhead, assistant to Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and a former longtime Congressional staff member in various capacities.

The National Grange was the key farm organization with some help from the National Farmers Union. Opposing them was the Nation's largest and most conservative farm organization, the American Farm Bureau Federation, whose president, Charles S. Shuman, said today that the farm bill "will be bad for farmers, consumers, and taxpayers."

President Johnson hailed the farm bill as an example of "good judgment and economic progress" that will benefit all Americans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I wish to express my thanks to the Senator from South Dakota for his comment in reference to the wheat bill and the part some of us played in its passage. This measure is of great economic help to the Midwest and the entire wheat-producing section of the country.

Visitors to my office in the last 2 days have told me that the passage of the bill represented the difference between solvency and insolvency.

I might add that, had the wheat measure not passed and had beef prices taken a turn downward, there could have been an economic catastrophe in the grain-producing section of the country. This would have been anything but helpful to the Nation's economy. It might well have planted the seeds of a recession or depression, doing away with the benefits of the tax cut.

The President of the United States is to be commended for having played a forceful role of leadership in gaining the passage of this bill, but the leaders in the House are also to be commended—the Speaker, the majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, the majority whip, Mr. BOGGS, and others who were so forceful in having the measure adopted. It was truly one of the most spectacular performances of the 88th Congress.

I commend and congratulate them, not only for the work they did in passing the

legislation, but for the beneficial effects that will follow therefrom.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator's point is well made. Mr. Blair makes the statement, in the article I submitted for the RECORD, that the activity of the House leadership on the bill has been one of the most brilliant legislative operations in the present session of the Congress.

I agree, too, with the point the Senator has made with regard to the economic importance of the bill.

I received a telephone call a week ago from one of the best wheat farmers of my State, Mr. Don Smith, of Ridgeview, S. Dak., in which he made the statement that, if this bill should fail of passage, he would sell his farm and get out of the farming business; that he could not operate another year without some reasonable assurances of a fair price on his production.

I am delighted with the action taken in the House of Representatives.

SPEECH BY MORRIS B. ABRAM BEFORE CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield, without losing the floor.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the distinguished president of the American Jewish Committee, Morris B. Abram, is well known as an eminent southerner, a humanitarian, and now as U.S. member of the United Nations Subcommittee on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. This week, he delivered a most provocative and informed speech before the Conference on Soviet Jewry, in which he suggested the creation of an international Eleanor Roosevelt Court of Human Rights. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Abram's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF MORRIS B. ABRAM

We have learned from our extensive studies in the social science that the problem of anti-Semitism, while it certainly affects Jews and has created havoc and catastrophe in human history—this problem is not really a Jewish problem. Wherever it exists, it is a problem of the whole of society.

We need no further proof really of the fact that Soviet anti-Semitism exists—one might say as an instrument of Government policy. We have seen too often its many manifestations, whether in campaigns of oppression against Jewish culture, religion, or tradition or whether in economic and political discrimination. Soviet anti-Semitism exists as a fact. It is one of the severe flaws of the Soviet society which, as we all know, is a closed society, closed, in various degrees but closed nonetheless. Despite breakthroughs here and there it remains a totalitarian system and this is where the trouble really lies.

Let me mention briefly an event of a few months ago which will underscore what I am trying to say. As some of you may know, I am the U.S. member of the U.N. Subcommittee on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities. In many areas throughout the world (particularly those

within the Communist orbit or those bordering on it) great capital is made of the race relations crises in this country. The United States is held up to scorn because there seems to be a division between what is considered to be our principles and our practices in some of our race relations.

Consequently, I decided to invite my colleagues, including the Soviet delegate on the U.N. Subcommittee, to visit Atlanta, Ga., and its environs for a few days in order to see for themselves what the problems and tensions were. That weekend of January 2 was a normally hectic weekend on the race relation front in Atlanta. There were a number of demonstrations, picketing, etc. During the course of the weekend I drove around with Mr. Ivanov, the Soviet representative on the Subcommittee, and showed him Atlanta as I knew it, since Georgia is my native State. In Atlanta and its suburbs we passed through many sections where there were large, well-built houses lived in by our Negro citizens. Mr. Ivanov had some difficulty in believing that Negroes lived in these impressive-looking homes. Furthermore, I told Mr. Ivanov that in the evening he might be treated to a demonstration of the local Ku Klux Klan who were rabidly anti-integration and of course anti-Negro. I said to him "under every one of these KKK bedsheets beats a proletarian heart."

In a closed society the perceptions tend to become fixed and rigid. There can be little or no flexibility or criticism. The proletarian class is "good"—everybody else is "bad"—even when looking at events abroad, a kind of filter is used which admits only stereotypes. That's why it was hard for my colleague, Ivanov, to believe that Negroes could live in good houses, or for that matter, that members of the proletariat could possibly be bigoted and full of hate.

If we wish to understand the patterns and purposes of Soviet anti-Semitism we must see then in the perspective of the society itself. Only then can we focus on the various possibilities of dealing with them. To a large extent I believe that Soviet anti-Semitism is derived from three basic psychological and political factors that have played a large role in determining Soviet policies:

1. The Soviet Union is a powerful state possessing the ultimate weapon but it frequently acts frightened and weak. I remember particularly in debates on the draft convention in the 1963 session of the subcommittee how violently the Soviets reacted to suggestions that a citizen should have the right to leave his country because he wanted to change his nationality.

2. This fear of free international travel, as a danger to the national state, is certainly unwarranted in the case of a country as strong as the Soviet Union. But the fear is related to the fact of a closed society and from this flows this second principle of Soviet conduct; namely, that the Government of the U.S.S.R. cannot admit there are any faults in its society at all. As a closed society the Soviet Union would find it very embarrassing to open its frontiers and recognize that any number of people would desire to emigrate. The Soviets, as I know them, would regard this as a criticism of the Soviet system and find it inadmissible.

There is no doubt in anybody's mind that there are Jews in the Soviet Union who might desire to leave the country as there well may be other ethnic groups or individuals. The fact that this is so does not prove that the Soviet Union is an intolerable system for all, or even a majority, of its citizens. It merely means that individuals may have a variety of their own reasons to choose one country over another, such as the ramification of dispersed families. From their fixed point of view Soviet authorities still deem it highly embarrassing for any person, just one person, to elect to leave its so-

ciety. Thus, the country's borders become the confines of a prison.

3. The third principle that must be considered in seeking to get an understanding of Soviet anti-Semitism is one that I would call the principles of the telescope. As I frequently have said to my Soviet colleague in the U.N., we look through the same telescope at the same time but we don't manage to see the same thing. The reason seems to me to be that you as a Soviet official look through the end which makes the individual smaller and the state larger, and the interest of the individual in this view is subordinated entirely to the interests of the state. I for my part as an American in an open society turn the telescope around and look through the glass that makes the individual large and the state small. Thus in my view the state exists to serve the needs of the individual while in the Soviet view the individual is seen as a cog in the great machine of the state.

The view of the state which is expressed in American political theory and which sees the individual of central concern embodies the prophetic Judeo-Christian view of social justice and individual human worth. The Jewish tradition I must say is compatible with the free and open society and it is quite possible that the Soviet leaders identify Judaism with democracy, except that they use an Aesopian term for democracy. In the Soviet jargon cosmopolitanism has frequently been the term used for democracy or Western democracy, and of course from the Soviet view this is bad.

The subordination to the state runs through Soviet policy both at home and abroad. Thus in a state in which the individual is of secondary importance, his need for expression, his traditions, his heritage, even his safety may be sacrificed for the temporary experiences of domestic or foreign policy.

This is nothing new, for the U.S.S.R. has long manipulated issues of religion as instruments of state policy and for power games whose lines of force are felt in many areas of the world. For example, as far back as 1923 the minutes of the 12th Communist Party Congress revealed a heated debate around the framing of the Soviet Constitution. Rakofsky, Bukharin, and other Bolsheviks argued that the constitution should be drawn up in such a way that would please the Germans and other Europeans. Stalin and his supporters countered that it was much more important to make an impression on the East by granting appropriate concessions to Eastern people.

Stalin stated openly that the targets were India, China and other European eastern countries. The Soviet's attitude toward its three major religious groups, Moslems, Orthodox, and Jewish is a rather blatant example of the political experiences which dictate Soviet policies. Since the Soviets have been concerned with infiltrating the Middle East which is overwhelmingly Moslem and since they realize that the Orthodox religion can be used as a propaganda link to otherwise antagonistic peoples, the Soviets have been posing as protectors of these faiths in many ways. At the same time it is recognized that an attack on Jews will probably be greeted with ill-concealed pleasure by the pan-Arab movement throughout the Middle East. Karl Marx's invective against religion as the "opiate of the masses" has been manipulated into a more practical equation: religion is the opiate of some of the masses some of the time.

Let me just add a small postscript to this point by quoting Halid Bardash, Syrian Communist Party leader, who has said "The Koran is the key to the gates of the Orient and we Marxists have learned from experience the need to be able to handle the key."

Of course, a closed society which insists on being responsible for everything that hap-

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7365

pens within its borders and uses every totalitarian technique to retain control frequently finds itself in some ironic situations which would be quite amusing if they were not so tragic.

For example, we of the American Jewish Committee a few weeks ago made public in the West a book called "Judaism Without Embellishment." By now this book has become famous throughout the world because it presents such clear and irrefutable evidence of Soviet anti-Semitism.

It is a hodgepodge, as you all know, of distortions, Nazilike cartoons and scurrilous attacks against Jews and Judaism. It bears the official imprimatur of the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Ukraine. Now what has happened? I have passed this book on to the Soviet representative Ivanov on the U.N. Subcommittee and have asked him all the appropriate questions as to whether this violates in his view the Soviet Constitution. Thus far I have not yet received a direct answer from him. But there have been some answers from the world at large. So blatant is the book, so vulgar and crude are its insults and slurs that Communist Parties in many countries of the world have set up a loud clamor attacking it and for the first time demanding an explanation from the Soviet fatherland. The *Freiheit* in New York, the *Neue Presse* in France and other papers and factions have made public strong disclaimers because they can ill afford to be associated with a country or a movement which so clearly apes the Nazi style.

What else has happened? The latest news we have heard is that a Soviet official has asserted the constitutional right on the freedom of speech principle that the book is entitled to be published no matter what it says about Jews and Judaism and the Soviet Government as a free libertarian society has no right to suppress it. Later, the Soviets sought to sidestep the book in a mild statement, but even the Communist paper the *Freiheit* in New York was not satisfied with this statement. On Saturday we received press reports that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has admitted what it called the anti-Semitic spirit and overtones of the book. We welcome this admission and we think it's a step in the right direction, but I believe that the Soviet attitude is still marked by public denial of a very compelling reality. Senator Javits and Senator Ribicoff have clearly pointed out in the Senate and in public forums the hypocrisy of the Soviet Government which practices one pattern of prejudice at home and seeks to disavow it publicly abroad.

I have had personal experience of the profound contradiction between Soviet policy and Soviet action. In the U.N. Subcommittee my friends from the Soviet Union are always anxious to draft a set of substantive principles to outlaw discrimination. They frequently push beyond the call of traditional civil libertarian practices in their public and zealous attacks against discrimination in the abstract. But I have noticed time and again that their wills begin to wilt where they face the problem of implementation and in the enforcement of the high sounding principles. The Soviet representatives sound like 19th century nationalists, jealously guarding their borders, when facing questions of implementation. They worry about sovereignty, they anguish over the rights of states (as opposed to the rights of individuals) and they always end up with the proposition that enforcement should be left to the state itself preferably unobserved and unreported in the international forum by any kind of international body including nongovernmental organizations.

We do not believe that any nationality, Germans, Russians, French or Americans are

angels. The Germans behaved under Hitler the way they did for many complex, social, economic and historical reasons but mainly because a totalitarian system destroyed their will and finally their power to react against war and to rebel against the deepest violations of human ethical postulates.

In fact, whatever history of anti-Semitism exists as part of the Russian ethos is being whipped up by design as it has been in the Ukraine by the publication of that ghastly book. What is the need to stir up long-smoldering hatreds? Clearly with the Soviet Union regressing to this crude form of anti-Semitism the situation of Soviet Jews is continuing to worsen. We must face the fact that the fate of Soviet Jewry will be whatever the government decrees it to be, the only limitation being the restrictions imposed by outside world opinion or the shifts of internal necessity.

The traditionally democratic French had the Dreyfuss case. But the anti-Semitism of the most powerful institution of that country could eventually be checked by the democratic political system brought to its senses by a free and enraged press and public opinion. America has had its share of bigots but these are contained by democratic procedures and safeguards. There seems to be a gyroscope in a mature democratic system which Jefferson referred to when he said—"error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

Extremist political systems which do not seem to have this gyroscope device—whether they are of a rightist or leftist tradition—usually have made the Jew an object of abuse. What happens most frequently is that the minority group is manipulated by the all-powerful government to meet the very needs it may happen to think it has at that moment.

I believe we make a great mistake when we are willing to settle for improvements in the distribution of economic justice within a state and excuse its absolutist ends and totalitarian methods. Socialism as an economic doctrine stripped of democratic ideals has never been friendly to the Jews. Nor has Populism in this country which in a primitive way sought the redistribution of wealth in the United States. I, as a Georgian, can never forget the role for example, that Tom Watson, the vice-presidential candidate on the Populist ticket from Georgia, played in the Leo Frank case and in his lynching.

The American Jewish Committee, I am proud to say, has long recognized and fought against totalitarianism of the left and the right and its spawn of anti-Semitism. Back in the 1940's the committee published two volumes which authoritatively and with extensive documentation revealed the patterns of anti-Semitism in the Soviet society. I must say that there was a great resistance, public resistance, among Jews and non-Jews alike, against some of these findings and insights.

We know now that the Jew has only been safe in those systems in which (a) all people are safe under a rule of law guaranteeing individual rights even against majority decision; (b) where the government has operated by popular consensus in which the Jew as all other citizens has freedom of choice; (c) where the government is dependent for continuous support of a free electorate which is (d) informed by press and speech, free and open, to oppose and cry out against violations of rights.

In our concern for Soviet Jews and at this very conference, we are not expressing merely a parochial interest. In fact, there is an inextricable connection between human rights and world peace.

As early as the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, which was a precursor to the Charter

of the United Nations, it was stated that the international organization to be founded should "promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms." There are other statements in the charter and later of course in the Declaration of Human Rights which can be used to make this point effective.

Then we turn to experience. Most knowledgeable people today believe that South Africa is a tinderbox. Why? South Africa has no quarrel over its borders with anybody, and the conventional causes of war are not present. Why? Purely over human rights violations. In the matter of Cyprus, the problem again which may bring Greece and Turkey into collision, is a human rights problem, growing out of ethnic conflicts. The India-Pakistan dispute is essentially a religious and ethnic quarrel, and the pattern is repeated elsewhere in the world.

The Declaration of Human Rights is one of the best known documents in world history. As much as we rejoice in it, it must be recognized as a document which has created a rise in the tide of expectations in all the peoples of the world. It has caused unrest and dissatisfaction among repressed and discriminated people who are no longer willing to forget their grievances. They want their freedoms now and the result is that there is a relationship between world peace and human rights.

We are not in this Conference to create new problems of world tensions; we are attempting to resolve them before they become unmanageable and explosive. It is true that every suggestion of dissatisfaction of minorities within the Soviet Union or South Africa does create tensions but it is better to deal with these problems before they become causes of conflict. Religion itself creates tensions when it posts a standard to be measured against present practice. But, on the whole, who can deny that much of mankind's ethical progress has been a result of the establishment of these ideals and goals and the exaltation by religion of man to follow.

Ethical progress is also frequently a product of international sanction since there seems to be no moral gyroscope within the U.S.S.R. and no enforceable law which can condemn the Soviets obvious purpose of committing cultural genocide. The only remedy is to arouse the sanctions of world opinion.

I believe that this Conference should call upon all religions and all men of good will to cry out against the shame of Soviet anti-Semitism. I believe that this Conference should do everything in its power to mobilize the moral force of humanity against the violations of human rights and decency.

I believe that this Conference should call upon the newly independent nations, the African and Asian countries, to speak out in the U.N. and in all international forums against the violations of ethnic identity which the Soviet Union is perpetrating. It is these nations, above all, who know very well what this violation can mean.

Let us also be realistic. Even the sanction of world opinion can be weak because of the inability to focus the spotlight of attention on human rights violations. Thus far U.N. forums have not developed into a major arena in which to cry out against the specific human rights violations which are endemic throughout the world.

I would recommend that the nongovernmental organizations, and academic institutions, perhaps under the name of Eleanor Roosevelt, band together to create entirely on a voluntary basis an Eleanor Roosevelt Court of Human Rights. This Court would be composed of representative justices of each of the five continents, who would meet perhaps across the street from the U.N., perhaps while the U.N. Human Rights Commission is in session. This Court could hear and determine complaints of human rights

April 10

7366

violations around the world after screening by responsible persons and organizations. The Court could be founded with the announcement that when the U.N. has assumed its obligations under its charter to protect human rights, the Eleanor Roosevelt Court would go out of existence.

But in the meanwhile we know that we must make reasonable and effective efforts in every avenue available to us to keep a vast totalitarian machine from losing its balance in regard to its Jewish citizens. No one can deny that this danger exists and no one can deny as we have learned too bitterly from history that it is our obligation to prevent catastrophe and not to bemoan it after it happens.

"PROFILE OF COURAGE"—TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY BY DR. SAMUEL BELKIN, PRESIDENT, YESHIVA UNIVERSITY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, so much has been written and said about our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy, that one sometimes feels there can be no more words with which to pay him tribute. Recently I received a copy of an address, "Profile of Courage," delivered by the president of Yeshiva University, Dr. Samuel Belkin, which does add to our appreciation and understanding of President Kennedy's memory. Distinguished scholar, author, educator, and spiritual architect of the largest and most comprehensive educational institution of its kind in the world, Dr. Belkin tells us how both courage of the mind and of the body were embodied in one man.

I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Belkin's address printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"PROFILE OF COURAGE"

Never in the history of this generation have the American people experienced such a deep sense of loss as that which resulted from the great tragedy of November 22. It was a black Friday when all media of communication shook us with the announcement that our President was cut down by an assassin's bullet. If all the tears shed had been collected, they would have constituted an ocean of sadness and sorrow. If all the unshed tears, concealed in hearts and minds, were gathered, they would have created a flood comparable to Jeremiah's lamentations.

On that Friday, I stood on the corner of 35th Street and Lexington Avenue with many people, and all of us shed tears without shame. A priest walked over and said, "Let us pray for his soul." An elderly gentleman answered him, "Father, I hope and pray that he will pray for us."

Thousands of eulogies have been delivered since. I do not intend these words as a eulogy but as an expression of appreciation of the man and evaluation of the events which took place.

HIS DREAMS AND IDEALS LIVE ON

I want to express our thanks to the Almighty that, with all our tragedies, with all our sorrow, with all our sadness, we still live in the greatest democracy. We have the utmost cause for pride and a deep sense of security that the continuity of the office of Presidency was immediately demonstrated in bold relief by the same man who stood on this very spot only 2 years ago as Vice-President of the United States, when he was

the recipient of an honorary degree. Today he stands at the helm of our Nation. We are all confident that he will not only preserve the ideals and dreams of John F. Kennedy, but will advance them.

We pray for his good health and for the continuity of this great Nation.

The late President became famous in several fields long before he reached the White House. I am sure many of you have read his notable book, "Profiles in Courage." There are many types of courage, and I would like to dwell particularly on two types: courage of the mind, and courage of the body. Courage of the mind built civilization. Courage of the mind is the essence of every form of progress made since the universe came into being.

Then there is that courage of the body which belongs to the animal kingdom. One sees the courage of the body in the madness of the bull, in the viciousness of the tiger, in the hatred of the snake, and in the vengeance of the lion. All of these have great courage of body. All of these are ready to kill, even at the risk of being killed. Mind you, if one lion kills, if one bull gores, if one snake poisons with his fangs, he is not just a lion; he is not just an animal. He represents animosity and hatred, hatred of an entire tribe, of an entire class, of the species to which he belongs.

Such was the man who assassinated President Kennedy. He is so described by Chief Justice Warren, who in his eulogy of our late and beloved President, said: "What moved some misguided wretch to do this horrible deed may never be known to us, but we do know that such acts are primarily stimulated by forces of hatred, and such forces are today eating their way into the bloodstream of American life."

VIOLENCE THRIVES ON HATRED

There is another type of physical courage. Such courage is exhibited by a man who may be motivated by compassion but who is mentally deranged. He is a man who listens to the various media announcing every moment of the day, "This is the assassin." Restless, impatient, this man loses his mind and, with confused emotion, applies physical force, pulling the trigger and killing the supposed assassin. He is not as great a criminal as the one who had nourished hatred throughout his life, but this man thinks that he is the law. His act is wrong, regardless of the motive. No man has the right to say, "I am the law."

COURAGE—THE ESSENCE OF THE MAN

The courage of the mind is personified by the life and action of our late President. Here is a young man, recently graduated from a great university, a man who may be considered an intellectual aristocrat. He joins the Navy and is assigned to a small vessel patrolling the Pacific. There he is challenged by a much superior force. His small boat is rammed and split in two. He receives a serious injury to his back; but he thrashes about in the water because he wants to preserve his own life. The body says, "I am discouraged; I prefer to sink in the bottomless sea," but courage of the mind dictates, and the mind says, "Human life is sacred. Continue on, and find land."

But that is not enough. Sick in spirit and in much bodily pain, he is not content merely with saving his own life, but realizes that a badly injured crewman also needs help and he brings his companion to shore. He saves another man's life, too, but this, too does not fully satisfy him. For 24 hours he swims up and down in search of a place when he may find food and drink to preserve his life and the lives of his comrades. This, my friends, is a profile of courage. This is courage of the mind, that great quality by which civilization endures.

May I say to you that no matter how much

our late President could have accomplished during the brief term in office, and certainly much has been accomplished, he will always be remembered for this courage of mind shown while a naval officer. Here we witnessed the greatness of the man.

I recall so vividly in 1955 when Mr. Kennedy, then a junior Senator from Massachusetts, spoke at a dinner in behalf of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine. It was, I believe, in the Concourse Plaza Hotel here in the Bronx. After lauding the programs and objectives of the newly established College of Medicine, he said that at the end of the last century, the average life expectancy was 47 years. He noted that by 1955, the average life expectancy had risen to 67—a gain of 20 years.

HIS LIFE TRAGICALLY CUT SHORT

Who would have thought only a few years ago that this great man, this gifted young intellectual, who became the 35th President of the United States, would never reach his 47th birthday.

With courage of mind and compassion of heart, he became the great champion of the freedom of man. The paragraph in his inaugural address which has often been quoted by freedom-loving people throughout the world is worth repeating. It reads: "Ask not what your country will do for you, ask what you can do for your country. My fellow citizens of the world, ask not what America will do for you, but what, together, we can do for the freedom of man."

LINKED IN HISTORY WITH LINCOLN

In this important address, the late President attempted to convey to the world that courage of the mind which would be ready to make sacrifices for the advancement of human freedom. His message recalls the words of the immortal Abraham Lincoln. When Lincoln was asked whether God is on our side of the war, he answered that he was confident that God was on our side; but the most important thing for us to decide is whether we are on the side of God. John F. Kennedy, by words and deeds, inspired the Nation to be on the side of human dignity and freedom. Hence, he was on the side of God. History will always link the destiny of those two great Presidents, not alone because both met martyr's deaths but, more significantly, because both possessed the courage of mind to fight for the same ideals.

Almost a century has passed since Lincoln emancipated the slaves; but the legal act of emancipation did not of itself achieve the complete freedom and dignity of man. It was only the first step in that direction. Our late President John F. Kennedy dedicated his life to fulfilling the hopes and aspirations of Lincoln, who failed to bring all of these to fruition because he, too, met an untimely death by an assassin's bullet.

FREEDOM WAS HIS CREED

We may divide the evolution of the freedom of man in our own history into three periods. Each period represents an advance in human dignity. The three periods may be symbolized by three religious and moral ideals; namely, charity, right, and justice. Even in the early days of our Nation, great moral leaders came to the realization that slavery was not an institution in which one could take pride. Many of them voluntarily emancipated their own slaves. These leaders were not ordered to do so by law, but were prompted by their own consciences, by their deep sense of charity. In this manner they reaffirmed their compassionate belief in the equality of men; but these acts were still only acts of charity.

Later Lincoln expounded the moral philosophy that freedom of man is not based upon charity and philanthropy. Freedom of man, he said, is not dependent upon the kindness of the individual, but is the inalienable right of every man. Upon this concept of the